(3)

CF 100 ₹

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 301 **/2004**

PETITIONER

NIRANJAN KAUSHIK, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, SON OF SHRI SHYAMLAL KAUSHIK, RESIDENT OF QUARTER NUMBER D-125, POLICE LINE INDORE, INDORE (MADHYA PRADESH), PRESENT POSTING: POLICE HEAD QUARTER, SPECIAL BRANCH, RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

P. R. No. 266/04
Presented by Shri Sushil Dubey
dated 29/01/04

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH, THROUGH : THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOME, D.K.S. BHAWAN, RAIPUR (C.G.)

2. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH, THROUGH : THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF HOME, VALLABH BHAWAN, BHOPAL, CHHATTISGARH

3. UNION OF INDIA, THROUGH : SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF HOME (DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND TRAINING, MINISTRY OF PERSONNNEL PUBLIC GRIEVANCES) LOKAYUKT, KHAN MARKET, (STATE REORGANIZATION CELL), NEW DELHI.

4. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, HEAD QUARTER, RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

5. THE DEPUTY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE (INTELLIGENT), (GUPT WARTA), RAIPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

Filed Today
Copy
27.1.04
Asstt. to A. G. Bilaspur

Subject/Adv

शपथ आयुक्त
एन. के. शुक्ला
बिलासपुर (छ.ग.)
29/1/04
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

Copy Received for U.O.I.
27/1/04

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, QUO WARRANTO

The petitioner respectfully begs to submit as under:-

(31)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.301 OF 2004

Petitioner : Niranjan Kaushik

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Mr. Rahul Mishra, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. V.V.S.Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State of Chhattisgarh/respondents No.1, 4 and 5.
Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, counsel for respondent No.2.
Mr. S.K.Beriwal, counsel for respondent No.3.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st Day of February, 2007)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, on instruction, submits that the petitioner intends to withdraw this petition.

2. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal